DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 396 PS 016 291

AUTHOR Caughron, Thomas
TITLE The Nanny in Historical Context.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the International Nanny Conference (Claremont, CA, August 21-25, 1986).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Caregivers; *Economic Change; *Family Life; Foreign Countries; Mothers; Parent Child Relationship; Social History; *Social Influences; *Social Status; Social Stratification
IDENTIFIERS England; *Nannies; *Wet Nurses

ABSTRACT

The position of nanny has evolved from the tradition of wet nursing. Originally, a wet nurse was a practical solution for a mother who was unable to nurse, or a means of saving parental anguish in the face of high infant mortality, or considered more desirable than a new mother's care in view of sanitation problems. As wet nursing developed, the nurse attended to her business within the conventions of the cottage craft system. Her services were contracted on the basis of her availability and her reputation. The trade was in babies, not in textiles, but the same principles applied. The nurse remained essentially in control of her own life, and her social connections remained largely undisturbed, for the infant was delivered into her own care. This pattern of wet nursing was common from the seventeenth century until industrialization changed British and Continental living arrangements. The practice of bringing the wet nurse into the employing family's residence and retaining her services for child care as a nanny reflects a microcosm of the factory system in which the work force assembled at a central workplace to promote efficiency and ease of regulation by managing agents. The nanny, or nursery nurse, emerged as a distinct profession in the early decades of the nineteenth century as Great Britain cemented into place its industrially designed class structure. However, the rise of the wet nurse and nanny would scarcely have been possible had not the status of mothers and women declined during the 18th century. Although the employment of nannies largely ended when World War II began, the ideal of providing home-based child care has recently made an astonishing turnabout, mirroring the feminization of the work force. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279396

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Nanny in Historical Context

"Other people's babies
That's my life!
Mother to dozens
And nobody's wife."

Dr. Thomas Caughron
Department of History
California State University, Long Beach

Paper presented to the
International Nanny Conference
Claremont, California
August 21-25, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas Caughron

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 016291

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Nanny in Historical Context

Reliance on wet nurses to suckle newborn infants until the age of weaning was on the increase in the early modern period. It is a curious juxtaposition to note that the popularity of the institution which had become wide-spread in western European society occurred in the same chronological period that modern social historians maintain was the origin of modern family consciousness. With a sense of discovery, Philippe Aries cited an early iconographic representation of this theme in the post-medieval European consciousness, the marriage capital in the loggia of the Doge's Palace in Venice (Arries, 1962. p. 344.). The capital is octagonal, carved with scenes that could be construed along the familiar pattern of the fragility and temporality of life which abound in medieval pictoral and sculptural representations. Something is remarkably different about this capital, however, which has been dated around the end of the fourteenth century. The events of engagement, marriage, consumation, and birth of an infant are projected within the bounds of a family. Family cohesion is underscored in the final eighth panel for tragedy has struck: the death of the child. This scene occurs after the preceding image of a nuclear family portrait, father and mother flanking the child, grasping him by the shoulders and hands. Tragically, the series of carvings ends with

premature death, the child lying with folded hands; the father and mother remain within the icon, praying and wiping away tears from the eyes. While the marriage capital is only one manifestation that a new family consciousness has developed in European society, there is evidence that it is not a unique representation.

Shakespeare contrived a delightful portrait of an old wet nurse taken permanently into family service in Romeo and Juliet. Juliet's nurse is, clearly, the heroine's dearest confidante, a lovable old "flirt-gill" to employ Mercutio's mocking epithet; she is a comic creation, her tenderness and motherly love for Juliet gracing her own coarse nature. The nurse knew Juliet far better than her own mother and could tell "her age unto an hour." Lady Capulet could not actually remember her daughter's age, but the nurse, using the liturgical calendar as her reckoning point, knew that Juliet would turn fourteen in two weeks at Lammas-tide. This recollection involuntarily called forth the memory of Susan, the nurse's own daughter, whom she believed was "now with God." The unspoken reality behind most women's offering their services as wet nurses is the tragic recognition that their own baby must have died, thus making the mother's milk available for hire. On the darker side, it is not hard to imagine that, in desperate circumstances, women sold their mother's milk to employers even before their own infant had perished. When the lady Juliet was three, the nurse recalled the Elizabethan technique for weaning the baby: she applied wormwood to her nipples and the bitter taste insured the baby would "fall out with the dug." (Romeo and Juliet, Act I, Scene iii.)

When Lady Capulet allowed that her reason to talk privately with her

daughter was the very subject of marriage, she proceded with the observation that many of Juliet's contemporaries from the noble houses of Verona were already mothers. Furthermore, by the age of fourteen Lady Capulet herself was already married and a mother. There was nothing amiss for a fourteen year old to be longing for a matrimonial settlement that could bring honor for her family and fecundity for her husband. Juliet replied that she had not dreamed of the honor of a proposal. The nurse, delighted with Juliet's chaste statement in comparison with her own bawdy reaction to the married state, complimented her charge: "An honour! were not I thine only nurse, I'd say thou hadst suck'd wisdom from thy teat."

Conventional Elizabethan wisdom firmly insisted on choosing decent and moral women to serve as wet nurses. It was believed that virtue was imparted with mother's milk, determining the courage and moral resolution of the infant. Mother's milk also was capable of transfering genetic traits such as athletic prowess, height and good eyesight. Early modern physicians warned against the resumption of sexual relations while mothers were still lactating. It was believed that engaging in the sexual act would spoil the milk and endanger the life of the infant. The new emphasis on companionate marriage, the union of two loving mates which was upheld by Puritan divines especially, placed women in a cruel bind. Sexual relations were elevated in importance, sanctified anew in marriages that pretended to more than property settlements. Wives were thus torn by feelings of tenderness to their husbands and by maternal bonding with their newborn. Contraception through <u>coitus interruptus</u> was no solution because it was

sexual excitement, not necessarily leading to intercourse, which was thought to spoil the milk. The companionate marriage, paradoxically, may have contributed to the rise of wetnursing. (Stone, 1979, p. 248.)

Juliet's nurse had continued in service in the Capulet household though her wet nursing was no longer needed. She disclosed that she was widowed but her husband, a merry man she avowed, had made a ribald joke that someday Juliet would fall backward when she had more wit. The joke was a silly piece of sexual buffoonery but the nurse enjoyed it so that she was obliged to repeat it twice to the irritation of Lady Capulet. Juliet's mother was anxious to introduce Count Paris' proposal of marriage.

Shakespeare's nurse was a garrulous and addled woman absolutely devoted to Juliet, even to the point of deceiving her employers from realizing that Juliet's lover was of the hated Montagues. Shakespeare employed the nurse in only a few scenes in his tragedy but embued her minor role with an extraordinary degree of emotional bonding between the wet nurse and her charge. Sixteenth century Englishmen would have understood immediately the deep ties that unified the two generations. Likewise, the deep emotional grief of Juliet's mother and father when they believe she has died on the eve of her wedding to Paris would indicate a nuclear family consciousness of the modern sort. The appearance of particularized, personal grief has occurred; and Shakespeare gives utterance to parental anguish caused by an only child's death:

> "Most miserable hour, that e'er time saw
> In lasting labour of his pilgrimage!
> But one, poor one, one poor and loving child,
> But one thing to rejoice and solace in,

And cruel death hath catch'd it from my sight."
(Act IV, Scene v.)

While there is new emphasis on the family unit in the early modern centuries, the increased use of wet nurses by upper and middle class families is not an anomaly. Rather, it is a realization of the economic conditions which made servants readily available to urban families. A lawsuit in Paris in 1677 illustrates how widespread the custom of wet-nursing had become. By the seventeenth century in France schoolmasters had succeeded in the right to marry; the uniformly clerical status of the profession had been abandoned. The University of Paris still forbade married masters to hold office within its administration but this was a conservative memorial of medieval celibacy within the teaching profession. Even in Protestant England fellowships at Oxford and Cambridge colleges were forfeited upon a don's marriage right up to Newman's time.

Part of the testimony brought into the litigation was that severe moral peril endangered the boys living with a married schoolmaster. This was due to their daily mingling with women of all ages. "Perils which result only too often from the familiarity which married masters are obliged to allow between the youths they are teaching and their wives, daughters and maidservants. They cannot prevent it...seeing women and girls combing their hair, dressing, adjusting their clothes, children in their cradles and swaddling-clothes, and all the other appurtenances of marriage." (Arries, 1962. p. 373.) The defendant in the case wisely did not attempt to refute societal wisdom by denying that schoolboys would not be adversely compromised by ubiquitous women in the household. Instead, he countered that his adversary was misinformed about the

privacy accorded women and girls in a proper Parisian home, even that of a middle-class schoolmaster. The charge was invalid and could only have been brought by a litigant with a very old-fashioned outlook unacquainted with the ways of modern city life. The women dress in complete privacy and thus are removed from the schoolboy lodgers. "As for children in the cradle, there are none to be seen in these Paris houses. Everyone knows that children are put out to nurse in some neighboring village so that there are few cradles and swaddling-clothes to be seen in the house of a married master as in the [litigant's] office." (Arries, 1962. p. 374.)

The custom of putting out infants to nurse in countryside villages had become quite common during the course of the seventeenth century. It was roundly denounced by contemporary moralists and educators long before Rousseau, a century later, condemned the practice and called upon society mothers to feed their children themselves. Wet nursing flourished in an age that had not come to insist that suckling was an inherent duty imposed on motherhood by nature. Nevertheless the practice of sending newborn infants to wet nurses appeared to be based on a fundamental experience. It is far too early historically to claim that this experience was based on notions of hygiene or that the country nurse provided a better gamble for survival on the grounds of sanitation. Perhaps nothing more than instinct confirmed widespread social practice. The immediate concern was how to feed an infant if the mother's milk dried up. Animal milk was, at best, a frightening option. Cow's milk was the poor man's fate and rural hygiene continued to take a terrible toll until the end of the nineteenth century. Indicating the

abject poverty of his childhood, the sixteenth century German humanist, Thomas Platter, could find nothing more expressive to write than that he was brought up on cow's milk.

Well-to-do parents made provision for their newborn infants to be nursed by women who had proven themselves to be good feeders. In certain circles this practice continued until the late nineteenth century when scientific discoveries had made animal milk and milk products aseptic. It has been ascertained that advertizements in The Times for a wetnurse occurred once every four days in 1822 but sixty years later, 1882, the advertisements occurred only once every twelve days. After that neither solicitors nor wetnurses are found to advertize for a position. (Gathorne-Hardy, 1973. p. 42.) During the intervening centuries a significant change obtained in the employer-wetnurse relationship: the wetnurse was moved into the urban residence of her employer and, frequently, was employed after weaning in a child care position. No longer was the infant taken to the country. Parents kept their children in the family residence but the care and nurture was still given over to a female in service. This development represents the origin of nanny. The term, "nanny," is historically vague. Nan or Nana serves as a pleasant diminuitive of Anne, a common name in England from the Middle Ages onward and which could have served as a generic Christian name for a serving girl or wet nurse. St. Anne was the mother of the Virgin Mary and, thus, the grandmother of Jesus. Christian iconography traditionally showed her watching over or embracing the Holy Child, often in the company of the Virgin. Such icons presumably had a cross-generational appeal. Nanny, of course, still is a common

appellation for a grandmother in Wales and in the north of England. The earliest written record of the word, "nanny," has been found in a letter, dated January, 1711, from Lady Mary Wortley Montagu to her old nurse. She commenced her letter with the salutation, "Dear Nanny." (Gathorne-Hardy, 1973. p. 68.). Obviously the noblewoman was using a term of affection which had been employed years before in her childhood. There is no reason to suppose "nanny" was an idiosyncratic usage or even of recent vintage.

Frequently the nanny took on the surname of the family by whom she was employed. Nannies also were entitled to be addressed as "Mrs.," a reminder linguistically that the origins of that title "Mrs." or "mistress" were honorific, not marital. Eighteenth and nineteenth century nurses were clearly unmarried women whose careers almost never could have included matrimony. The assumed surname of a nanny was generally fixed after a certain period of service with the family. So that, if the nanny took up responsibilities in a new household after a generation of children had been reared, she would continue to be known by the surname of her former employers. Nannies also affixed the titles of aristocratic employers as surnames. One nanny was in service to a family, though the surname was Laurence, was related to Quentin Hogg. She insisted in subsequent positions on being called Nanny Hailsham. (Gathorne-Hardy, 1973. p. 69). Snobbery was endemic among nannies. The ranking of nannies was squarely based on the prominence and aristocratic lineage of the employing households. Nannies and related subspecies of nursery care-givers proliferated in the late Victorian plethora of domestic servants. Acquiring the surname of the family was a zealously

guarded prerogative of only the Head Nurse. She was assisted in the full-blown panoply of Victorian nursery attendants. These gradations were duly incorporated into the household ranks with appropriate badges and pay rates. Life in service was governed by a welter of petty privileges and infractions of etiquette were looked on as impertinances and indignities. The supremacy of the nursery over the rest of the household was attested by the fact that the reigning nanny did not sit at table with the other servants but was served in her own room, a privilege regularly accorded only to gentlefolks.

An incontrovertable fact also contributing to the nanny's exclusivity was that the position of the mother was in decline. From Keltic days in Britain there emerged an enduring tradition that the natural parents had no business trying to bring up their own progeny. Children of both sexes were sent off to politically and socially superior households to learn the appropriate physical skills, oral history and literature which distinguished a warrior society. While the practice of taking hostages may have contributed to this tradition of raising other men's children, it cannot account for it entirely. The evidences of affection between foster brothers and foster sisters are plentiful enough in Gaelic literature. The sense of allegiance and obligation enjoined by fosterage outweighted family or blood connections. In medieval England the custom of sending gently-born young boys to serve in noble household was an integral part of educating males in the rites and values of knightly society. In Scotland the Earls of Mar had the hereditary privilege to serve as foster parents to the Stuart dynasty. The practice of farming out children was universal

among rich families. (Gathorne-Hardy, 1973. p. 35.)

Boarding schools were founded in late medieval and Tudor centuries attracting a national clientele rather than from the narrow confines of a municipality or parish; these foundations retain to the present day the somewhat confusing appellation of "public schools." No other European nation equals Great Britain in maintaining a network of and solid middle class reliance on boarding schools to educate both sexes:

> "An Italian seeing droves of whey-faced, tearful, seven-year-old upperclass little English boys, clutching the hands of their mothers--or even, still, their Nannies--at Waterloo or Paddington or Euston Stations at the start of another term, might well write home in exactly the same vein today as his countryman did five hundred years ago. (Gathorne-Hardy, 1973. p. 35.)

Nannies, in contrast to wetnurses, were, of course, the products of a social revolution that occurred in the eighteenth century. Most often historians focus on the economic and technological achievements which transformed England first from an agrarian to an industrial social organization. The complexity of that century is increased by considering a profound break with the past in terms of marriage and illegitimacy patterns. The traditional pattern of late marriages and few illegitimacies which had obtained from the Middle Ages began to errode as the economic and social certainties of the past broke down.

Since before the Conquest the bulk of the population lived in the counties closest to the Channel and the Home Counties clustered around London and the principal royal residences. Whole villages were abandoned and centuries-old cultivated fields were given over to pasturage in the eighteenth century as a result of scientifically-improved crop yields and the economic advantage of wool production over

tillage. This massive social dislocation has been described as the Great Population Shift. Thousands of rural villagers were evicted from the South and trekked to the Midlands, contributing to the phenomenonal rise of the factory system, whereby workers came daily to the work place in the new industrial centers. A new urban working class was being created with two generations.

The former associations with the land were forgotten and new technology allowed women and children to be subsumed into work force with dire social and pathogenetic results. The older pattern of manufacture was a cottage craft system or "putting out," to use the British terminology. Raw materials, often fleece or yarn, were distributed from a central supplier to participating spinners or weavers, who took the materials to their own homes and worked at speeds dictated by economic necessity to return the finished product. The profit from the finished cloth was, at least, partially invested in raw materials which were again taken to the worker's home for manufacture. Marriage patterns were exceedingly stable. Furthermore, the age of marriage was significantly delayed within the traditional society based on agriculture and "putting out."

The Industrial Society created an alternative source of wealth. Nothing could be any more businesslike or so calculating as a peasant marriage. It was preeminently a business deal locking the financial interests of two families, a contract pure and simple. Corresponding to the phenomenon of social dislocation, the eviction of peasant families from the soil tilled by a dozen generations of their families was the "invention" of courtship. Courtship became a flourishing institution by

living or moral profligacy. Healthier diets before and after birthing allowed more children to survive as did improved medical and hygienic practices.

On the other hand, servant girls who had become pregnant had few options beyond loose living or open prostitution. This resulted in a wider cycle of illegitimate births and contributed to an urban subculture of illegitimacy and prostitution. Matthew Mayhew's portrait of Victorian London shocked contemporaries as it showed the underbelly of that cosmopolis noted for its wealth and moral rectitude. Mayhew wrote appalling accounts of the London poor, of Jewish rag-men, of whole Irish families of three or four generations living at parish workhouses. Prosperous middle class were insulated from scenes of abject poverty and moral degeneracy. Nothing shocked nineteenth century moralists more than Mayhew's disturbing sociology of the class of "vagrant trading and selling girls," often child prostitutes:

> "the most remarkable characteristic of these wretched children is their extraordinary licentiousness. Nothing can well exceed the extreme animal fondness for the opposite sex which prevails amongst them...such circumstances as the promiscuous sleeping together of both sexes, for example of the older persons indulging in the grossest immorality in the presence of the young, and the use of obscene expressions may tend to produce or force an unnatural precocity." (Mayhew, 1985. pp. 181-182.)

Nevertheless, patterns of marriage and legitimate births slowly began to reassert themselves.

Wet nursing may be comprehended within the framework of "putting out." The wet nurse attended to her business within the conventions of the cottage craft system. Her services were contracted on the basis of her availability and her reputation. The trade was in babies, not in

the mid-eighteenth century. As a theme it made its way into literature and in sermons, rarely without negative overtones. Marriage was concluded to be the result of romantic feelings, not the economic well-being of the family.

As "true love" appeared to be the sine qua non of a successful marriage, illegitimacy statistics skyrocketed. The century, 1750-1850, have been described as an "illegitimacy explosion." In Frankfort in 1750 around 5% of the births recorded were illegitimate. Fully a quarter of all births were out of wedlock a century later in Frankfort. In Bordeaux illegitimate births rose dramatically through the nineteenth century. By 1840 one out of three births were illegitimate. This would indicate a profound sexual revolution was occurring in Europe concurrent with the process of industrialization. (McKay, Hill, Buckler, 1983. p. 698.)

No doubt some of the flaunting of Church-sanctioned rules about marriage came from resentment against the ancien regime. In France free thinking allowed many to question the old ideas of late and economically secure marriage favored by an immobile, conservative peasantry. Mobility was on the rise as industrialism required a centralized urban work force. Young people were less and less subject to the approval of village elders. Young men who previously would have felt obliged to marry their lovers or who were forced into conventional moral standards by village elders, now had the option of running away to cities. Servant girls were forced to fend for themselves. Promises of marriage almost always preceded sexual intimacy. (McKay, et. al., 1983. p. 699.) Illegitimacy cannot be explained merely as the result of abandoned

textiles, but the same principles obtain. She remained essentially in control of her own life, her social connections largely undisturbed for the infant was delivered into her own care. This pattern of wet nursing was common from the seventeenth century, as the Parisian lawsuit suggested, until the period of industrialization changed British and, later, Continental living arrangements. Bringing the wet nurse into the employing family's residence and retaining her services for child care as a nanny reflects a microcosm of the factory system. The work force assembled at a central workplace to promote efficiency and ease of regulation by managing agents. The nanny or, more properly, the nursery nurse really emerged as a distinct profession in the early decades of the nineteenth century as Great Britain cemented its industrially-designed class structure into place.

The rise of the wet nurse and, subsequently, the nanny would scarcely have been possible had not the decline of the mother's status occurred in inverse proportion. How far that process had gone and how many mothers had abandoned the rearing of their children to other women in service may be loosely ascertained by the vehemence that reformers like Jean-Jacques Rousseau unleashed on women who did not suckle their own young. In the late eighteenth century there appears a new literature urging aristocratic and upper bourgeois women to experience the tenderness of maternal bonding with infants. Rousseau expanded the whole frontier of sensibility to include a delight in intimacy with newborn children. With the new child-centered educational theory of the Enlightenment comes an exuberant optimism about human potential, an abandonment of theologically-imposed Original Sin. The subject of

infanticide was brought into direct sunlight and sharply condemned. The whole notion of illegitimacy was exposed as the cruelty of hypocrisy though there is no reason to believe that everyday beliefs were changed among common people as a result of an impassioned discharge of an educational reformer. The Enlightenment insisted on the positive benefits that could be accrued by individuals and society at large from the imposition of education. John Locke had written in 1692 in Some Thoughts Concerning Education the following:

> "I would have children very seldom beaten. 'Tis to make slaves and not virtuous men to use them to be governed by the fear of the scourge and to know no other motive of their actions, no other rule of right and wrong, but the cudgel. A gentler persuasion and reasoning will most times do much better... They understand it as early as they do language, and if I misobserve not they love to be treated as rational creatures sooner than is imagined."

Nevertheless, educational reformers, even of the stature of Locke and Rousseau, rarely carried the day. Negligent schools and the non-involvement of parents in the schooling process will, no doubt, be a permanent feature. Dickens presented an horrific portrait of boarding school barbarity at the mildly fictional Dotheboys Hall, a Yorkshire establishment presided over by the swinish, yet comical Mr. Wackford Squiers. Dickens wrote in Nicholas Nickleby of existing schools, distilled into one fictional creation, whose purpose was to relieve embarrassed parents of awkward or bastard offspring. The regular ritual of dispensing brimstone and treacle to the schoolboys, ostensibly as a medicine but actually as an appetite spoiler offended young Nicholas who serves as a persona for Dickens himself. How far removed is this nightmarish academy from Locke's gentle insistence on reason as the

keystone of sensible child-rearing!

Why did mothers' role diminish particularly in the eighteenth century? Certainly new standards of wealth and leisure provide a partial answer. Gentlewomen had new outlets for diversion. There is scant reason to suggest that wealth inspired increased educational opportunities for women. Restoration and Georgian ladies in England were certainly less accomplished than their sixteenth-century forebears. Anne, the last Stuart monarch, possessed neither the intellect nor the self-discipline that characterized Elizabeth Tudor. Elizabeth's mastery of classical and modern languages, philosophy and theology mesmerized contemporary scholars and foreign courts. In contrast, eighteenth century women appear shallow, gossipy and empty-headed, avid for the enticements of London society as they are portrayed in contemporary dramatic literature. They are a far cry away from their sixteenth-century ancestresses who translated the gospels from Greek and the moral philosophers from Latin. Tudor and early Stuart bluestockings were earnestly involved in weighty considerations, particularly in matters of faith.

The tender-aged Jane Grey, the tragic "nine-days queen" of Northumberland's abortive coup to deny Catholic Mary Tudor the succession dictated by Henry VIII's will, was not the meek and mild maiden invented by the Victorian sentimentalists. While awaiting her own sentencing in the Tower she wrote vehemently when her former tutor, Dr. Harding, found it expedient to renounce his Protestant beliefs to curry favor with the new Catholic regime. Her polemic shocked later generations accustomed to maidenly blushes and innocent sensitivity in

sixteen year old girls:

> "How canst thou, having knowledge, or how darest thou neglect the law of the Lord and follow the vain traditions of men; and whereas thou hast been a public professor of his name, become now a defacer of his glory? Wilt thou refuse the true God, and worship the invention of man, the golden calf, the whore of Babylon, the Romish religion, the abominable idol, the most wicked mass? Wilt thou torment again, rend and tear the most precious body of our Saviour Christ with thy bodily and fleshly teeth?" (Plowden, 1986. p. 110-111.)

In those precarious last days waiting for Mary's political decision regarding the fate of her inopportune young cousin, the Lady Jane was comforted by the company of two attendant gentlewomen and her own nurse, Mrs. Ellen, who was allotted the generous sum of twenty shillings a week. (Plowden, 1986. p. 109.). Lady Jane's own mother, the Duchess of Suffolk, far more concerned with salvaging the loyal reputation of the Suffolk line, made no attempt to come in contact with the daughter she had forced to marry the Duke of Northumberland's son only a few months earlier. Lady Jane was abandoned in a feverish attempt to clear the fortunes of her own family, a scapegoat for Suffolk participation in a plot to maintain a Protestant succession on the English throne.

Royal or aristocratic mothers were often forced by political considerations to relinquish natural rights of access to their children, even their newborn infants. Historians are not in a position to know if this separation was the cause of maternal anguish or private suffering. The facts surrounding the deposition of royal children rarely grant any insight into the psychological frame of mind of either child or mother. By the terms of the Treaties of Greenwich (1543) whereby Henry VIII expected to gain control of the independent and formerly pro-French

kingdom of Scotland, provisions were drawn up for the marriage of Edward, the English heir apparent, and the infant daughter of James V, known as Mary, Queen of Scots. The Stuart queen had acceded to her throne less than a week old and was a great prize on the international marriage market. Henry VIII assumed his prestige and martial prowess would cow the Scots into his taking guardianship of the Scottish queen. In earlier negotiations he had demanded the Scots deliver Mary to his keeping at Greenwich but the northern kingdom proved recalcitrant. He settled finally her governorship on the resident English ambassador at Edinburgh, Sir Ralph Sadler, who was to control access to the baby even from her own mother. Henry VIII actually stipulated that Mary of Guise, the French widow of James V, not be allowed to lodge in the castle with her baby but ought to be kept elsewhere in the city, visiting her daughter only from time to time (Fraser, 1969. pp. 18-21.). The salient political fact was that Henry was supporting the proto-Protestant faction of the Scottish nobility and thus to wreck the "auld bond" between Scotland and France, further complicated by Reformation struggle. Contemporary observers noted that by limiting conversation between Mary of Guise and her daughter was a means of reducing Catholic influence at court. None recognized the English manoeuver as an unnatural interference in the maternal bonding process. Only the political reality was appreciated.

Other Stuart infants were sundered from maternal love and approbation. James Stuart had been awaiting the news of Elizabeth's death. Ten days after the last Tudor died, the King of Scotland, confronting the finest prospect any Scot can hope to see, set out upon

the road to London. His queen, Anne of Denmark, and two oldest children, followed his route south within the month. Only the three year old baby Charles was left behind in Edinburgh, in company with his wet nurse, Jean Drummond, and Marion Hepburn, his "rocker," the lowest person of a nursery staff. When he became king years later, Charles provided for his nurses with significant generosity. (Carlton, 1983. p. 2.) Charles was a sickly child. James' younger son finally arrived in London, two years after his parents and siblings. Few English courtiers wanted the honor of managing the princely household, because they were afraid he might die in their charge. Apparently Charles learned to walk very late. Contemporary accounts, however, may have exaggerated his physical weakness. One may speculate on the effect on personality development that being separated from close family members might have had on Charles. As king he outwardly displayed resolution or blind stubborness, whichever you prefer, that might suggest that self-sufficiency was a guise affected at an early age. As difficult as physical problems might have been, were "the psychological ones that involved trying to move between the fairly secure world of the Carey's household [his guardians] and the rather alien one of the court, which necessitated coming to terms with his father, mother, brother and sister." (Carlton, 1983. p. 5.).

Charles' intense privacy, his inaccessibility to his subjects and his dependence on a few male favorites to establish linkages with his kingdom as a whole may have an origin with the neglect and indifference shown him by his mother. She rarely spent time with her younger son, calling him "a fool and wilful."

> The lack of a satisfactory close relationship with his mother--or with a substitute mother, such as the proverbial English nanny--meant that in later life Charles found it hard to make friends, particularly with women, which added to his sense of shyness and insecurity, and deprived him of "the feeling of a conqueror, that confidence of success that often induces real success," that Freud called "the legacy of a mother's favour." (Carlton, 1983. p. 7.)

While royal children may have had less interaction with their parents than commoners' offspring, a certain indifference to children generally might suggest that natural parents were anxious to avoid the heartbreak of their child dying in the early years. Mourning was not required at Court for a child less that seven years old. Death played a natural rhythm in all levels of society, all too frequently visiting infants and mothers in childbirth. Right up to the eighteenth century some families christened all their sons with the same Christian name intending that it should survive the next generation though doubting all sons would escape childhood mortality.

The British and Irish population increased steadily in the nineteenth century. Between 1801 and 1911 it grew by over 11% annually. (Gathorne-Hardy, 1973. p. 65.) This accounted for the proliferation of household servants that had to be somehow provided for, however meagerly. During the early years of Victoria's reign the average family consisted of six or seven children. Nevertheless, there was not great concern over a child's happiness or personality development. The nursery was properly the child's sphere and nannies and nursery menials were easily recruited from the burgeoning work force. "Children were kept in the nursery," wrote Jane Austen's niece about the author's childhood,

> ...out of the way not only of visitors, but of their parents;

> they were trusted to hired attendants, they were allowed a great deal of exercise, were kept on plain food, forced to give way to the comfort of others, accustomed to be overlooked, slightly regarded, considered of trifling importance. (Gathorne-Hardy, 1973. p. 61.)

Nannies have received surprisingly little historical investigation. Perhaps the nursery and the lower class status of nursery maids has had little appeal to the traditional historians who too rarely saw the connection between the rulers of empires and the hands which rock the cradle. Social historians have not focused much attention upon the denizens of the nursery expect by way of speculating upon the psychological make-up of certain outstanding British statesmen. Studies of the relationships between Winston Churchill and Lord Curzon and their nannies indicate that more historical investigation could produce fruitful results. On the other hand, nannies for their own sakes could be the basis of future scholarship. What were nannies' social and educational origins, their moral and religious biases? How did the interfamily referral network function? By what means was advancement secured? The golden age of nannydom was presumed to have ended with the outbreak of World War II; the aristocratic and upper class income and rates of taxation imposed by Labour governments supposedly led to the steady reduction of the number of nannies in the 1950s and 1960s. Only a few nanny training colleges in Great Britain were to survive the decline of the Empire and many of their graduates were destined to take positions on the Continent and in the oil-rich Persian Gulf emirates which prized an English accent and fluency in the universal tongue.

Nevertheless nannies are not merely a topic for historical research for the profession is not moribund or backward-looking. The nanny as an

ideal of home-based child care providing has made an astonishing turn-about which mirrors the important changes in feminization of the work force. These changes have had the effect of making the British nanny and the American counterpart a highly prized service commodity. The phenomenon of upper-middle class married women and single parent heads of families engaged in previously all-male employment positions have created a solid demand for professional nannies in Britain, the United States and throughout the English-speaking industrialized world. The rejuvenation of the nanny profession underscores the desirability of further research, placing the nanny in historical context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aries, Philippe, Centuries of Childhood, A Social History of Family Life, Vantage Books, New York, 1962.

Carlton, Charles, Charles I, The Personal Monarch, Routledge and Keegan Paul, London, 1983.

Fraser, Antonia, Mary, Queen of Scots, Delacorte Press, New York, 1969.

Gathorne-Hardy, Jonathan, The Unnatural History of the Nanny, Dial Press, New York, 1973.

Mayhew, Henry, London Labour and the London Poor, Penguin Books, New York, 1985.

McKay, John P., Hill, Bennett D., Buckler, John, A History of Western Society, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1983.

Moore, Katherine, Victorian Wives, Allison and Busby, London, 1974.

Plowden, Alison, Lady Jane Grey and the House of Suffolk, Franklin Watts, New York, 1986.

Staunton, Howard, edit., The Works of Shakespeare, Routledge, Warne and Routlege, London, 1862.

Stone, Lawrence, The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800, Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1979.